

REMARKS

Claims 1-33 are pending. By this Response, Claims 9, 22, and 26 are amended. Support for amendments of claims 9 and 26 are found in the claims as filed, throughout the specification and, for example, at page 12, lines 13-16. Support for amendment of claim 22 is found throughout the specification and, for example, at page 4, lines 16-20.

In response to the Restriction Requirement, Group I is elected. Pursuant to the Examiner's grouping of claims, the elected claims are 1-32. The election is made with traverse. The Examiner has not put forward reason that any a serious burden to the Examiner if restriction is not made as required in MPEP § 808. Moreover, the Examiner has not made even the allegation that there would be a serious burden, especially in regard to the numerous, detailed species requirements. Further, Applicants do not agree with the Examiner's assertions in the paragraph bridging Pages 2 and 3 of the Detailed Action. It is earnestly solicited that the restriction requirement in this case be withdrawn, at least with respect to the species requirements.

In response to the requirement to elect a species, "A" is elected. Further, as required by the Examiner, "a." is elected.

In response to the further requirement of the Examiner to elect a species, between "i" and "ii", it is noted that Claim 9 is currently amended to specify only that the monitoring apparatus used in the method comprises one source and one receiver. Thus, restriction to one source and three receivers or to three sources and one receiver is moot.

In response to the further requirement of the Examiner, "Aa" is elected *with the proviso* that the monitoring apparatus is moved relative to the earth's surface during the response period

as well as other times. It is believed to be impractical, given the nature of the detection, to start movement of the monitoring apparatus during the response period.

In response to the further requirement of the Examiner, and in regard to "Ba", "particle displacement only" is elected.

In response to the further requirement of the Examiner, "BB" is elected.

The Examiner has also required identification of the claims corresponding to the elected species. It is noted that the Examiner has already deemed claims to correspond to the various species identified in the Detailed Action as set forth on page 6 of the Action. Initially, it is believed that only the election of "Aa" affects the listing of claims under the groupings set forth by the Examiner. It is also noted that claim 6 should be included in the list identified for "Aa" in as much as it is dependent from claim 3 and that claim 25 should be included in the list identified for "Aa" in as much as it is dependent from claim 23. Therefore, the claims that correspond to the elected species are 1-4, 6-23, and 25-32.

Conclusion

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul B. Saveréide
Registration No. 36,914

Customer No. 24113
Patterson, Thuent, Skaar & Christensen, P.A.
4800 IDS Center
80 South 8th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2100
Telephone: (612) 252-1550